

Docket No.: 242744US2/phm

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN RE APPLICATION OF: Tsutomu OHISHI, et al.

SERIAL NUMBER: 10/660,535

GROUP: 2625

FILED: September 12, 2003

EXAMINER: POPOVICI, DOV

FOR: COMPOUND MACHINE FOR SCANNING AND PRINTING AND A METHOD THEREOF

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowability of the claimed invention. In response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the Notice of Allowance of October 10, 2008, Applicants respectfully submit the following comments.

In the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance pages 3 and 4 of the Notice of Allowance state in part:

“The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:  
The closest prior art of record, namely, Suzuki et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0033964) does not disclose, teach or suggest, an image forming apparatus comprising an operation panel and hardware resources used for image formation including a scanner engine, an application, and a platform that exists between the application and the hardware resources, the platform including an OS and at least one control service to control an execution of each requested processing of the hardware resources according to a function call from the application, wherein interprocess communication is performed between the control service and the application, the application causing the image forming apparatus to function as: a display part configured to display a selection screen for selecting a transfer destination of scanned data from among a plurality of transfer designations on the operation panel, as claimed in independent claim 1.


Independent claims 10, 19 and 20 recite the same or similar claimed limitations or analogous features as recited in independent claim 1,

therefore, claims 10, 29 and 20 are allowable for the same or similar reasons as stated in independent claim 1 above.”

Although the above comment appears to address Claim 1, it is respectfully noted that independent Claims 10, 19 and 20 do not include this language. For example, Claims 10 and 20, being directed to a scanned data method and a computer readable medium, respectively, do not include a reference to structure as may be implied and/or inferred by the examiner’s statement. For example, the claims do not include a reference to “display part”. Claims 10 and 20 are patentable by virtue of the limitations recited therein rather than the structure of the apparatus. Regarding Claim 19, it does not include a reference to “display part” but rather the claim recites “means for displaying”. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the above-quoted statement does not apply to Claims 10, 19 and 20 to the extent the language used in the statement differs from the language of the claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James J. Kulbaski  
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel. (703) 413-3000  
Fax. (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 07/09)

John Sipos

Registration No. 61,985